The Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....815 E. Main Street
Manchester Bureau.....1103 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau...109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....815 Eighth Street

BY MAIL, POSTAGE PAID.	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo
Daily with Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	.5
Daily without Sunday	4.00	2.00	1.00	.3
Sunday edition only	2.00	1.00	.50	.2
Weekly (Wednesday)	1.00	.50	.25	

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs), Manchester and Petersburg—

	One Week
Daily with Sunday	14 cents
Daily without Sunday	10 cents
Sunday only	5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 21, 1910.

HENRY STUART'S OPENING GUN.

Henry Stuart, the man who never forsook a friend or feared a foe, who, in the strength of his own self-reliance and intelligent industry, has passed through poverty to affluence, as free as the air of his native mountains and as true, began the fighting in the Ninth District at Gate City yesterday. His keynote speech rings with defiance to his political enemies and with courage for his friends who have, much against his will, called him into service for the redemption of the Ninth District from the hands of the common enemy. It is not Henry Stuart's fight, as such; but the fight of the people of the Ninth District, the white people of the Ninth District, the white Republicans as well as the white Democrats who would be represented at Washington by a Congressman who would esteem himself the servant of the people rather than the servant of party, who would regard his work for them of higher concern than the distribution of political patronage, who would not be subservient to the power and influence of great party leaders while deaf to the interests of his constituents.

Stuart does not leave any room for misunderstanding or misrepresentation of his position on any question of public moment. He does not dissemble or cloak himself in mystery. He makes the tariff one of the leading issues of the contest; he leaves no room for doubt as to his views on the race question; he would prefer a campaign free from personalities—"I have inaugurated no such issues; I shall invite no such issues, but I shall shun no such issues."

He would have the tariff revised not by its friends and beneficiaries, but by the friends of the American people. In the revision of the tariff he would take into consideration the question of guarding the wages of the workingmen in this country, and the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, not as ascertained by the trusts, but as determined by men who represent the people. He would make the interests of the people who are compelled to use the manufactures of steel and iron his concern rather than the interests of the Steel Trust, which paid last year upon a capitalization of $500,000 dividends amounting to $158,000,000. He would give the people cheaper woollen clothing instead of requiring them, as they are now forced to do under the Payne-Aldrich bill, "the best tariff bill the Republican party has ever passed," to pay $120,000,000 more for their woollen clothing than ever before. He would make the tariff protect the many instead of enriching the few. He would make the tariff a national not a sectional thing. He would look after the interests of the Southern consumer rather than after the enrichment of the Northern manufacturer. He would give the people cheaper woollen and cotton clothing and he would give the farmers of the South cheaper bagging for their cotton and cheaper ties. He would drive out the trusts which protect foreign competition by stifling home competition, and, bound by no political bargains, he would represent the people of the Ninth District in their interest and not for his personal benefit or for the promotion of his personal friends.

The chief interest in the Ninth District, however, as we look at it, is in Mr. Stuart's attitude on the suffrage question. He is a white man and stands for a white man's government, not to the neglect of any of the personal or property rights of the negro, but for the supremacy of his own race; for the poor white man as well as the rich; for the unlettered white man as well as for the white man who has been able to uplift himself by his own efforts or because of his surroundings; for the education of the children of the poor and the promotion of all the higher and better interests of the white people of his District, many of whom are descendants of the soldiers who won American Independence at King's Mountain.

The speech of Henry Stuart should ring from every mountain top in the Ninth District and echo from every valley. It is the call of a strong, clean, high man to the white people of that District to rally for their race, to strive as they have never striven before for the higher and larger things that would promote their welfare and happiness. No man, however poor and friendless, was ever turned empty-handed from Henry Stuart's door. At the call of his friends, and purely as a matter of the highest public duty, he has entered the race for Congress "not alone as the standard-bearer of a great political party, but as citizen, friend and neighbor." There is absolutely no comparison between him and his opponent. He ought to receive the vote of every white man in the District. He is capable, he is faithful, he is loyal to the Constitution, and in this trinity of Jeffersonian virtues he should achieve a great victory.

OUGHT TO FIGHT, BUT WON'T.

All sorts of stories are coming out of Oyster Bay and Beverly these days, the newspaper reporters having determined to make the Colonel and the President fight whether they want to or not. "Colonel to Fight Later;" "Beverly May Speak Soon—Doubted if Roosevelt Break Can Long Be Ignored;" "Roosevelt Lays Down Law to Taft;" "Roosevelt Sends Taft An Ultimatum." These are only a few of the headlines picked up at random from newspapers, and it is doubtful that there is more than a very fine grain of truth in them. Yesterday the Colonel denounced as "a tissue of lies from beginning to end" the story of the New York Times, which prints only the news that is fit to print, that he had sent an ultimatum to the President demanding that he throw Sherman overboard or take the consequences, and doubtless there will be a great many more denials of other stories before the atmosphere is cleared.

We do not know what the Colonel will do with the President, or do to the President, and we don't care; but if we were the President we would make a few remarks about the Colonel that would identify that personage. It is not at all unlikely that the Colonel has said a good many things that he ought not to have said; but it is certain and sure that he has not said anything and will not say anything that he thinks will hurt himself. There is a persistent statement that he does not like the way Taft has been running things; but the story never goes any farther. We wish he would specify, and in that way add to the gayety of these times when everybody in the Republican party appears to be blaming everybody else for doing things which everybody on that side claims has never been done at all. We have not the least doubt that the Colonel will "do" the President if it comes handy and there is anything to be made out of it for the Colonel; but, so far, the Colonel seems to have depended upon the unwarranted statements of those who have visited him to keep him near the front of the stage.

There never was just such a condition in the politics of the country, and it is all very interesting to the Democratic watchmen on the tower. If the Democrats could only get together and stay together until after the next Presidential election, behaving in a seemly common sense way meanwhile, we should not be bothered any more after that date with either Roosevelt or Taft.

LEE, THE CONSTRUCTIVE LEADER OF THE SOUTH.

"Southern Leadership Since the Civil War" is the title of an able paper in the current number of the North American Review. Its author is Professor Garland Greener, of the University of Arkansas, a native Southerner and the son of a Confederate soldier. The article was called forth by the recent unfavorable comments upon the placing of the Lee statue in the Hall of Statuary at the National Capital.

Taking up these protests, Professor Greener declares that they indicate a tendency in the North "to consider the achievements and the spirit of the South as in no sense forming a part of our national heritage." The conditions resulting from the war are briefly discussed in the article. The social and political upheaval is commented upon and explained, and then Professor Greener asks:

"To a problem so stupendous as this, who in the South brought the most charitable spirit, the largest outlook and the noblest solution? With what leadership of lower conceptions has his spirit been forced to combat? In the ultimate light of history, how should his labor be judged? . . . I should unhesitatingly say that the man who most fully exemplifies the loftiest leadership in the South since the war is . . . Robert Edward Lee—not only the consummate flower of the old South, . . . also the beacon and prophet of the new. . . . I believe that if the American people would repair their greatest neglect of the legacy derivable from a single character in their history, they would have to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the real nature of Lee. . . . And the period most worthy of emphasis—the one which is generally overlooked—is that in Lee's life which followed the collapse of the Confederacy."

In direct contrast to the patient, wise, broad leadership of Lee, Professor Greener sets off the spirit represented in the writings of Thomas Dixon and in the poetic works of Father A. J. Ryan. The "vitriolic" note struck by Dixon, he says, is the natural outcome of a narrow spirit of resentment and bitterness at the wrongs of the days of Reconstruction. He laments that the spirit of Father Ryan's poetry, which he takes as expressive of a large body of Southern sentiment past and present, is so pathetic, so mindful, of the past and so forgetful of the present. With gentleness but with frankness, he criticizes this sad feeling of the laudator temporis acti, this "tendency to idealize a departed condition." Neither of these sentiments, he thinks, has been helpful to the South, while, on the other hand, Lee's patient and far-seeing spirit was constructive and helpful, dwelling hopefully in the present and future.

"I have heard from a hundred standpoints and in a hundred disguises," says Professor Greener, "the impossible longings of Ryan expressed, and I have said in my heart that they were as the borrowed splendor of the moon when compared with Lee's reply to a kinsman who had asked what was left to be done: 'You can work for Virginia—to build her up again, to make her great again.'"

With sympathetic touch, Professor Greener then outlines the position in which General Lee found himself after Appomattox. For the first time in his life he was without official position, his estate had been confiscated, he was almost without money, he was suspected, scanned, and even assailed by the people of the North. Yet, points out Professor Greener, "with undaunted fortitude and forbearance he met the issues that the times presented. He counseled patience and submission. He urged economy, insisting that the lavishness of ante-bellum days could no longer be maintained. He encouraged industry. He gave his old soldiers a rallying cry that any brave people should admire. 'Tell them they must all set to work, and if they cannot do what they prefer to do, do what they can.'" Professor Greener then shows that General Lee practiced what he preached by taking up the work of training young Southern men at Washington College.

It is in his summary that Professor Greener points out the constructive character of Lee. He says:

"Let me state more clearly than I have hitherto done Lee's basic claim on the gratitude of the nation. It rests in the fact that his spirit was essentially creative. Perchance the assertion sounds strange to those who have heard, time out of mind, that the South, unbendingly arrayed against the innovating forces of the North, stood first of all for conservatism. Let us revise the idea that admits no exception and make current the knowledge that the best men on both sides were gifted with qualities not confined to their section. Even a superficial study of Lee's deportment after the surrender will disclose how flimsy is the argument sometimes leveled at his greatness that his temperament was destructive or at best negative. By precept, on the right occasions and by practice always, he showed, amid obstacles that might well have appalled, an ardent desire and intention to weld together the sundered purposes of Americanism and to shape and erect something lasting in that long warfare for the emancipation of mankind. . . . Because he wished above personal advancement to toil constructively for the good of his country, he was not to be tempted from his humble work at Washington College by the most enticing offers of lucrative employment. In answer to one such offer, he gave the slogan of a new era, 'I have led the young men of the South in battle; I have seen many of them die on the field; I shall devote my remaining energies to training young men to do their duty in life.'

"In view of these facts, was not Robert E. Lee a man whom Southerners should emulate and Northerners commend? Is not his example, like the example of Lincoln, too benign for malice to revile unreproved? Is not his spirit a majestic possession which our people as a whole should forever cherish?"

We agree with Professor Greener that the nation would do well to become more familiar with the post-bellum period of the life of Lee. Such a lesson of patient contentment with present duties and difficulties despite past misfortune cannot be elsewhere found in American history; nor anywhere more unselfish devotion to the leadership and uplifting of a prostrate people. Professor Greener has but stated a fact in declaring Lee the great constructive leader of the South, for such of a truth he was.

STAUNTON IS SAFE.

In its luridly false reports of the cave-in at Staunton, the yellow newspapers have shown how pernicious they can be in damaging the reputation of a place. Most thoroughly do we agree with the Staunton papers in what they have said by way of protest against the overwrought and highly colored stories which have been sent out from that city by the alarmist correspondents sent there by out-of-town papers. From these spectacular accounts, one might think that judgment day had already arrived in Staunton and that the city is hardly less inhabitable than a volcano in eruption.

That there has been a disaster at Staunton is true. Some houses have been swallowed up by the cavernous yawn of old Mother Earth, but no lives have been lost. The reports indicate that the cave-in is practically over and that no serious results hereafter need be expected.

Staunton is essentially an educational centre. It is full of schools—good schools—some of them known and patronized from one end of the country to the other. These institutions are a splendid commercial asset of the city and have helped to upbuild it.

Scattered broadcast throughout the United States, however, are the yellow falsehoods of the Munchausen-like correspondents sent out from the larger cities. These stories vividly portray Staunton as about ready to topple over and fall into the bottomless pit. The patrons of the Staunton schools read these accounts, take it for granted that they are so, and forthwith doubt the advisability of sending their wards or children back to Staunton to school. In this way, great harm is being done to Staunton by such stories.

The newspapers of Staunton and the rest of Virginia, accurate and uncolored in their facts, do not largely come into the hands of these out-of-State patrons of Staunton schools. Many of the highly colored narratives sent out by the yellow correspondents do.

Staunton is safe. It is our earnest hope that no damage to its scholastic institutions will result from this deplorable mendacity of yellow correspondents.

THE NEGROES IN THE SOUTH.

Taking the records that are kept in Georgia, North Carolina and Virginia of the property owned by negroes, Booker Washington, himself a Virginian and the most eminent man of his race in this country, and, barring Dr. Blyden, in the world, told the Negro Business Men's League in New York the other day that a conservative estimate would show that the negroes of this country are adding from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 to their wealth each year. He estimated that the negroes of the country, and mostly in the South, of course, are worth not far from $600,000,000.

This is doing wonderfully well for a people who, according to the statements of Northern newspapers and Northern reformers, "have no chance at all." The Hartford Courant was so much impressed by Washington's statements that it was moved to make this, we suppose some persons would call "magnanimous," admission: "The records show that, all things considered, the negroes in the South are making good use of their opportunities. But," adds the Courant—with the sagacious object of protecting its rear against the advances of the Bulkeley mercenaries—"but it would be idle to say that they are treated fairly when in thirty days twenty-six of their race are killed by mobs, and the lynchers go unpunished."

This has reference to the recent horrible butchery of inoffensive negroes in Texas—a crime that has been denounced by all law-abiding white people in the South—and eight of the white men charged with the murders have been arrested and lodged in jail and are to be tried for murder. They were run down by the regular law officers of the State, all of them white men, and they were captured without one word of advice from any of the keepers of the conscience of this country in Connecticut or at Oyster Bay. If their guilt be proved, it is hoped that every one of the eight, and as many more as the law can lay its hands on, will be hanged. In the meantime, we hope that the Courant will try to make it clear to its readers that even in Texas it is not customary to kill as many as twenty-six negroes in thirty days. That is the impression its "magnanimous" observations would make upon the Connecticut mind.

DOWN WITH DICTATORS.

The New York World cries down with the dictators; big dictators and little dictators, Roosevelt and Taft and all the rest, and it is entirely right. But how would it do also to down with the newspaper dictators? Queer, isn't it, how we always seem to overlook them in demanding that the other dictators get out of the way?

"UNWORLDLINESS."

(Selected for The Times-Dispatch.)

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt and where thieves do not break through nor steal, for where your treasure is there will your heart be also."—St. Matt. vi. 19-21.

The earthly is poor and fickle and fleeting. The heavenly treasure is sure and enduring, incorruptible. The thought expands to all that belongs to the world—all externals, contrasted with the inner and more spiritual.

One way to test ourselves is to ask: "To what do my desires naturally turn? When my thoughts wander in church or in prayers, whither do they tend? My first thought in the morn, my last at night; where do they lead me?" Where your thought gravitates there is your treasure.

The Christian professes to have his treasure in Heaven. Then let him keep his eye single and fixed. Let him have a single purpose and be poor in spirit. It is the intention that guides and distinguishes our conduct. It is the motive that lies open, in God's sight, and which He will sanctify and bless. If our intentions are pure, they will hallow our lives, however poor and obscure they may appear outwardly. All conduct is lighted by the intention and motive. Then see that it is kept pure and true.

Worldiness is one of the greatest dangers that can beset a man's soul. It is no wonder that we find our Lord speaking strongly about it; for it is an insidious specious, plausible enemy.

It seems so innocent to pay close attention to our business. It seems so harmless to seek our happiness in this world if we only keep clear of open sins. Yet there is a rock on which many make shipwreck to all eternity. They "lay up treasures on earth" and so forget the storehouse in Heaven. If our treasure is earthly our hearts will be earthly also.

Every man has some one thing which he makes his treasure, and upon which he sets his heart. Now, Christ designs not to deprive us of our treasure, but to direct us in the choice of it.

He gives us a caution against "the things which are seen," for, after all, they are fleeting and vain. And a treasure must be something precious, valuable, and imperishable.

We must not covet an abundance of the things of this world, nor be still grasping for more and more of them. We cannot put our trust in them for security and help.

Consider, we are not laying up for our posterity in this world, but for ourselves in Heaven. If we know and remember what we are made for, how large our capacities are, how long is eternity; that our souls are ourselves; we shall readily see that it is a foolish and unwise thing to lay up "our treasure only on earth."

We have good reason why we should not keep our treasure on earth. It is liable to two-fold loss and decay, from within and without.

(1) From corruption within; if it be fine clothes, the moth frets them and they are gone. If silver and gold, they tarnish and canker. Worldly riches have in them a principle of corruption and decay; they wither of themselves, and "make themselves wings."

(2) From violence without; for thieves break through and steal. Every hand of violence will be aimed at the house where treasure is laid up. Nor can anything be stored so safe but that we may be spoiled of it.

There are treasures in Heaven as sure as there are on this earth. They are the only true pleasures, since they are at God's right hand and abide for evermore. We must first believe in such a happiness and resolve to be content with it, and nothing short of it. If we thus make those treasures ours, they are "laid up." We may trust God to keep them safe for us. Let us then not burden ourselves with the cash of this world, which will but load and defile and perhaps sink us, but lay up in store good securities.

The promises of God are bills of exchange, by which all true believers retain their treasure in Heaven, payable there, and thus we make it sure.

Now that the automobiles are to be regulated to the extent of requiring all of them to carry a simple "honk, honk" horn, it is hoped that the authorities will give careful attention to the motor cycles, some of which make as much noise as two automobiles and a steam piano combined.

This is the time of the year, before the fall and winter rains begin, for the people to be working hard on the public roads. Next winter, when the places that are hard now are as soft as mush, and the wagons and carriages and horses begin to sink out of sight, it is insisted that nobody shall shake his head at us and say that we did not at least tell him what to do.

The Charlotte Observer says that the "Descendants" will not put up a tablet to that eminent North Carolinian, Barbara Frietchie, "because, for one thing, the Barbara Frietchie of near-history and near-poetry is a rank myth. So far as we know, the real Barbara Frietchie was a good citizen, and no people who set their faces against confusing history with myths of any kind should do her wrong." Of course, if "the real Barbara Frietchie" was not "a rank myth," we can understand why the "Descendants" should not wish to put up a tablet to her memory.

So far, we believe, not a single wagon in Richmond has been fitted with brakes. The owners of the horses and mules, it would seem, should care enough for their own property to protect it, but the lawmakers have their duty to perform without regard to the owners of the mules and horses, and in the name of humanity should pass a law making it a misdemeanor for any wagon or dray to be operated without brakes in this town. The hills are very steep and the loads are awfully heavy.

Hartford, Connecticut, has cumbered the earth for two hundred and seventy-five years and is old enough to know better than to vote for Bulkeley for United States Senator, it does not matter what Ullman, or whatever his name is, says about it.

The Lynchburg Advance is responsible for this:

"The Washington Herald welcomes the Esperanto Congress in the following manner:

"'Al vi, sentuxiasmuloj el multaj landoj kap diversaj statej kaj urbojkiuj estas venintaj al la chefurbo de nai nacio por kunveni pro la esperekle monda lingvo, Esperaton, la Washington Herald donas koran bonvenon.'

"We would say that this is a very teyrichbvuhzmoptyfasuzmkl way of putting it."

All of which is about as intelligible to us as will be the fine French patois spoken to the Frenchmen by the Houdon Statue Commissioners.

Here it is again: The Manchester (N. H.) Guardian says that there are 8,205 Johnsons now living in Chicago, nearly three thousand more Johnsons than Smiths. This is a Johnson year—Johnson at Reno and Johnson in California, Johnsons everywhere except in Texas, where Cone had the support of the Houston Post, and, naturally, dropped out of sight, although to memory dear.

The Emporia Independent says: "We agree with the Chase City Progress that ex-Governor Montague would adorn the bench of the United States Supreme Court." So far, Mr. Montague is the only nominee of the State press.

The Manassas Journal says: "Just now it is Esperanto. A little while ago it was Volapuk. In the meantime, let us hope Americans will continue learning English, and English of the Hawthorne, Irving and Herbert Spencer kind and not any hideous simplified sort." Very good!

Shall Richmond have a "toot" chorister for automobile horns? That is the question put by the Manassas Journal.

"Progressive Richmond has notified all automobile owners that their horns must toot alike. We wonder if all of them will be required to line up occasionally and prove the harmony of their toots, or will the city appoint a toot expert to make the rounds?"

We must have one, if we have to send for Caruso.

As to the Esperanto Congress, the Manassas Journal says:

"There opened in Washington last Sunday the Congress of Esperantists It is not an assembly of 'sneezers' as the name might suggest, but a body of learned men trying to introduce a universal world language. Of course, it is an impossible undertaking, but it will do no harm."

"Sneezers" is good.

Referring to the Frietchie myth, and the exposition of its falsity by Capt. W. Gordon McCabe, the Manassas Journal says:

"But, mark you, Whittier's publishers will never make a note of this. It is said that when the Quaker poet's attention was called to the utter lack of historical truth in his poem, he merely said, 'Well, it ought to be true then.' Poor old friend! Little did he know Jackson."

And Whittier's attitude is that of the Northern historian.

Speaking of freak chickens, the Appomattox Times-Virginian says:

"Drakes Branch is boasting of chickens with two heads, while old Cumberland has been raising chickens with four legs, and everybody knows that one chicken leg is worth any number of chicken heads."

There are some candidates for the Ananias Club yet at large.

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Height and Weight.

What should be the height and weight of a boy at the age of fifteen?

Nature has not fixed any particular standard for that age, and both height and weight vary greatly, for it is about at that age that a boy commences to develop in a marked degree. Physical Director Studer, of the Y. M. C. A. of New York, in an article on "The Thousandth Man," in which he tells what a perfect man should be, does not take up any one under the age of sixteen. At that age he fixes the height of the perfect man at five feet one and seven-tenths inches and the weight at 100 pounds.

European Astronomer.

Please tell me if there is any European astronomer in Richmond. T. M.

None that we know of.

It Is Better to Have Loved, Etc.

Do you think it is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all?

We have no information as to this query.

The Meaning of X.

Please explain in your next issue why X stands for Christ and Xmas for Christmas. W. F. WATSON.

X has from ancient times been understood as a symbol representing the cross and Christ, interchangeably. It is a very old abbreviation. The letter "X" is in form of a cross, and the cross is the accepted symbol of Christ

Milwaukee.

What is the meaning of the name Milwaukee?

It is an alteration of Mennewaukee, the name given by the Algonquin Indians to a river in the State of Wisconsin, and it means good earth, good country, or beautiful or rich country. The early French settlers pronounced it Minnwaukee, and finally the settlers who came later changed it to the present name, Milwaukee.

Rhodes Scholars.

From whom can I obtain a list of the Rhodes scholars at Oxford, England, from the Pacific coast?

From F. J. Wylie, the Oxford agent of the Rhodes trustees, Oxford, Eng.

Negro Disfranchisement.

If every negro in the United States were disfranchised, would not the country be overwhelmingly Democratic?

It is unsafe to predict. It is possible to approximate the number of negroes of voting age, but not the number of those who vote nor for which party they vote. The vote for Taft was 7,637,676; for Bryan, 6,393,182. Whether the negro vote actually cast, subtracted from 7,637,676, would turn the balance is a matter of opinion.

Communion.

Do all Christian denominations commune?

No.

Cutter Service.

To whom must one apply for information relative to admission to the revenue cutter service of the United States?

Write to the school of instruction in such service, South Baltimore, Md.

Quotation.

Who wrote: "We join ourselves to no party that does not carry the flag and keep step to the music of the Union"?

Rufus Choate. It occurs in a letter which he addressed, in October, 1855, to the Whig convention, which met at Worcester, Mass.

SPECIAL WHISKEY FOR ROYAL FAMILY

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

SCOTLAND, and especially Ireland, teems with whiskey stills, that through their omission to pay the tax upon spirits provided by law, engage the unwelcome attention of the inland revenue officers, of the police and of the constabulary. There is one of those whiskey distillers—however, which, although it pays no duty whatsoever on its produce, is nevertheless given a wide berth by the officers of the law, for it is situated on the Balmoral estate, and the owner of the distillery is no less a personage than George V., who in this, as in most other matters, is "above the law," since, according to the English Constitution, "the King can do no wrong." It is true that the whiskey is manufactured not for sale, but for the consumption of the sovereign, of the members of his family and of some particular personal friends; an excuse which perhaps the owners of the illicit stills elsewhere in the Highlands and in Ireland might be perfectly ready to advance, with some degree of truth. The royal distillery is situated on Lochnagar, and the whiskey produced on Lochnagar, and the whiskey produced is of the very finest possible quality, and is matured in vats in the cellars of Buckingham Palace for twenty years before consumption. No other Scotch whiskey than that of the King's distillery at Lochnagar is served on any of the royal tables in England.

From London comes the announcement of the marriage there of Count John Clary-et-Aldringen, only son and heir of the prince of that ilk, to a young Bohemian girl, the daughter of a small shopkeeper. The dispatch announcing the marriage describes the house of Clary-et-Aldringen as "mediatized," but this is not the case. Its members are free in law to wed whomsoever they please; are not subjected to the restrictions imposed upon the mediatized, or formerly petty sovereign, families in matters matrimonial, and do not enjoy the latter's prerogative, shared by the reigning dynasties, of contracting morganatic alliances. Therefore, providing young Count John has fulfilled the English legal requirements, his marriage in London cannot be sundered or denied recognition by his relatives, and the daughter of the petty shopkeeper of Prague will become the mistress of the beautiful chateau of the Clary-et-Aldringens at Tepitz, in Bohemia, and of the palaces of the head of the house in the Herrengasse, at Vienna, and on the Grand Canal, in Venice.

The Clary-et-Aldringens constitute part and parcel of the great territorial nobility of Bohemia, where they have vast possessions. They are of Italian origin, the founder of the family having been that Florentine noble, Barnardo Clarle del Friule, who became naturalized in Bohemia, and who was admitted into the Bohemian aristocracy away back in the fourteenth century. The name and the arms of Aldringen came to the family through the marriage of Baron Clary in the seventeenth century with the last surviving sister of the famous Austrian general, Count Aldringen. The title of prince was granted to the head of the family 160 years ago by Empress Maria Theresa for military services rendered during the Seven Years' War against Frederick the Great. The youngest brother of the present Prince of Clary-et-Aldringen, Count Manfred, was for several years Prime Minister of Austria, while another brother was for long the envoy of Emperor Francis Joseph at the court of Brussels. The prince's only sister, Edmee, is the widow of that Count Charles Nicholas de Robilant who was in turn the Italian ambassador in Vienna, Minister of Foreign Affairs at Rome and Premier to King Humbert. The prince, despite his extensive estates and his various palaces, is not particularly well off, having spent more money than he could afford for political purposes as leader of the Ultra-Conservative and Clerical party in Bohemia.

Although the dukedom of Otranto, created by the first Napoleon in favor of his Minister of Police, Fouche, is a French dignity, yet the new duke is, like his father before him, a Swede, holds a commission of captain in the crack regiment of Dragoon Guards, is a chamberlain of the Queen of Sweden and a godson of Queen Alexandra of England. On the occasion of the visit of Edward VII. and of his consort to Stockholm three years ago, he was attached to their suite, and decorated on that occasion with the English Victorian Order. The duke's mother, by birth a Swedish Countess Stedingk, married as her first husband the Hon. William George Grey, one of the many sons of the second Earl Grey, and as the Hon. Mrs. Grey was appointed one of the ladies in waiting to Queen Alexandra on the occasion of the latter's marriage in 1863. Mrs. Grey, after becoming a widow, married the late and fifth Duke of Otranto, continued to be a member of the household of Queen Alexandra until the latter's accession to the throne on the death of Queen Victoria, and died shortly afterwards at Baden-Baden, having throughout her long association with Queen Alexandra enjoyed the latter's intimacy and friendship to a degree comparable only to that possessed to-day by the Hon. Charlotte Knollys. The new duke, sixth of his line, is married to Countess Madeleine Douglas, of the Swedish line of the great Scotch house of Douglas, which has also two branches in Germany.

Fouche, the first duke, hailed from Nantes, where he was a dealer in pigs. He was twice married, the second time to Gabrielle de Castellane, by whom he had no children, and the first time to Jeanne Coiquaud, of whom it has been asserted without foundation that she had at one time been a nun. She was renowned for her ugliness, had aggressively red hair, red eyebrows and red eyelashes, like her husband and their first two children, both of whom died young, were albinos. Barras, in his "memoirs," describes them as the most hideous couple that he ever in his life encountered. Yet they were devoted to one another, and Fouche, who showed such cruelty in connection with the terrible massacres for which he was responsible at Lyons during the days of the Terror, and afterwards as Minister of Police, was the most tender and loving husband to his homely wife, who accompanied him everywhere, even when he was sent as ambassador to a foreign capital, always remaining in the background. Four children survived—a daughter, who died not long ago as Comtesse de Thormes, and whose own daughter, the Comtesse de Castelbajac, is herself a grandmother. There were also three sons—Joseph, Armande and Athanasius—who each in turn bore the title of Duke of Otranto, the late duke being the son of the youngest of the three brothers.

Fouche, after the overthrow of Napoleon, found difficulty in being allowed to settle down anywhere, owing to the part which he had played in connection with the kidnapping and execution at Vincennes of the ill-fated Duc d'Enghien, and by reason of the fact that he had voted for the death of Louis XVI. and of Queen Marie Antoinette, he was expressly excluded from the amnesty which Louis XVIII. found it prudent to issue after securing possession of the throne. Emperor Alexander in Russia, the Prince Regent in Eunland, King Ferdinand of Spain, as well as other sovereigns, refused to permit him to settle in their respective countries. He found himself driven from pillar to post, ostracized everywhere, to all intents and purposes, an outcast, until he finally died at Trieste. Taught by sad experience, his sons betook themselves to Stockholm, where they found in former Field Marshal Bernadotte, who had meanwhile become King of Sweden, a sovereign not only willing to permit them to make their home in his dominions, but also to take them into his service. Perhaps he did not forget that he himself had been on duty as a soldier at the foot of the scaffold when King Louis was executed, and that on his left arm was indelibly tattooed a Phrygian cap along with the motto, "Death to Kings and Tyrants!"

The second, third and fourth Dukes of Otranto all held high office at the court of Stockholm, and the late duke was master of the horse to King Oscar of Sweden.

The body of the fifth Duke of Otranto, who has just died at Stockholm, is being taken to France for interment in the cemetery of Ferrieres, where the first duke, that is to say, Fouche himself, lies buried, along with his two wives, his daughter, the Comtesse de Thermes, and his three sons, his grandson and great-grandson. The Chateau of Ferrieres, now owned by Baron Edouard Rothschild, head of the French line of that financial dynasty, belonged to Fouche in the days of the empire, and when, after the overthrow of the first empire and his exile, he sold it to the Rothschilds he expressly reserved that small parcel of ground which is included in the cemetery, and where he had constructed his family mausoleum.